



ERIC GIBSON
INTERIM DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017

September 17, 2009

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF Little Page Wireless Telecommunications Facility Major Use Permit; P08-013; Log No. 08-09-004

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

P08-013; Log No. 08-09-004
2. Lead agency name and address:
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
San Diego, CA 92123-1666
3.
 - a. Contact: Marcus Lubich, Project Manager
 - b. Phone number: (858) 694-8847
 - c. E-mail: marcus.lubich@sdcounty.ca.gov.
4. Project location:

26652 Little Page Lane, Ramona, CA 92065 in the Ramona Community Plan Area, an unincorporated portion of San Diego County; APN: 286-111-48.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1154, Grid 4/B
5. Project Applicant name and address:

Horizon Tower; 5600 Foxtail Loop, Carlsbad, CA 92101

6. General Plan Designation
Community Plan: Ramona
Land Use Designation: (20) General Agriculture
Density: .025 du/ acre
7. Zoning
Use Regulation: A72, General Agricultural
Minimum Lot Size: 40 acres
Special Area Regulation: A, Por S

8. Description of project

This is a request for a Major Use Permit for the installation and operation of an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility. The project consists of twelve panel antennas mounted to a proposed 35 foot faux broadleaf tree. Supporting equipment would consist of 6 equipment cabinets and one utility H-rack that would be enclosed by a 7 foot CMU wall with a stucco finish that would match the existing buildings onsite. The proposed lease area is 1,600 square feet. Trenching for electrical and telco utility lines will run approximately 240 feet southwest, from the proposed equipment enclosure to an existing utility pole.

The project would involve approximately two vehicle trips per month for routine maintenance of the facility. Access to the site would be provided by a driveway connecting to Little Page Lane. Old Julian Highway is the nearest public road. No extension of sewer or water utilities will be required by the project because the project does not require water or sewer service. The project does not include any offsite improvements.

The project is located on a site that is occupied by 3,710 square foot single family residence with an attached garage, solar panels and a water tank. All of which, will remain onsite.

The following project design considerations would be implemented to minimize environmental impacts: the proposed enclosure will have a stucco finish and will be painted to match the existing residence onsite to harmonize with the existing environment and the 7 foot high CMU wall will attenuate noise impacts associated with the proposed equipment cabinets.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Lands surrounding the project site are used for agricultural and single family residences. The topography of the project site and adjacent land is gently sloping hills and native vegetation. The site is located within ½ mile of Old Julian Highway.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Landscape Plans	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz. Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

September 17, 2009

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Land Use/Environmental Planner
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation. Generally, the viewshed from a highway includes the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way and extends the distance of a motorist's line of vision, using a reasonable boundary when the view extends to the distant horizon. Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers.

Based on a site visit completed by Marcus Lubich on April 21, 2008, the proposed project is not visible from a scenic vista, a County priority scenic route, or a State Scenic Highway, therefore the project will not have an adverse impact on these visual resources. Furthermore, the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on the existing visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as having a general continuity of residential uses intermixed with visual elements of natural vegetation and agricultural uses. The proposed telecommunications facility is compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality because the facility is naturally screened by surrounding vegetation and the facility will be surrounded by a block enclosure designed to match the existing residence onsite.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts to scenic resources within a scenic vista, a County priority scenic route, or a State Scenic Highway because the project is not located within the viewshed of any of these resources.

- b) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The surrounding area has land designated as Prime Farmland, however the proposed telecommunication facility would not interfere with existing or potential future agricultural operations. Furthermore, the facility is proposed on a site that is not currently being used for agriculture. Therefore, the project will not have a significant adverse project or cumulative level impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is zoned A72, General Agricultural with a Special Area Designator of 'A', Agricultural Preserve, with no Williamson Act Contract. The General Agricultural Zone is an agricultural zone. The proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because the A72 zone allows for wireless telecommunication facilities upon issuance of a Major Use Permit. The proposed facility will not conflict with existing uses in the agricultural zone. Additionally, the language within Ramona Agricultural Preserve No. 9 describes wireless telecommunications facilities as compatible uses pursuant to Section 1(B)(10) of said Preserve. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would not conflict or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation because emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. Emissions associated with the project include very limited emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities and trips to and from the facility. The limited scale of construction and the limited vehicle trips (1 – 2 per month) associated with the project would not constitute a significant air quality impact. Furthermore, any grading in excess of 200 cubic yards is subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs and PM₁₀. Also, the project does not include any elements that would cause objectionable odors and the project would not result in exposure of significant pollutant concentrations to sensitive receptors because the project will not produce significant pollutant concentrations.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; or interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Report submitted July 6, 2009 prepared by Karl Osmundson, County staff biologist Beth Ehsan has determined that the site supports native vegetation, namely, oak woodland. The oak woodland includes both coast live oak and Engelmann oak, a County List D sensitive plant species. One Group 2 sensitive animal species, Orange-throated whiptail, was observed on a rock outcrop on-site. No other sensitive species were observed on-site or determined to have a moderate or high potential to occur on-site. The location of the proposed 40' X 40' equipment area and utility trenching would not require removal of any Engelmann oaks or the rock outcrop where the Orange-throated whiptail was observed. Installation of faux broadleaf tree, equipment area, and trenching would impact 0.07 acre of oak woodland habitat, including understory vegetation and oak root zone, and 0.02 acre of disturbed habitat. Impacts to 0.07 acre of oak woodland and resident sensitive species will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through purchase of .21 acre of oak woodland in an approved mitigation bank in the central foothills or northern foothills ecoregion. Impacts to disturbed habitat are considered less than significant and do not require mitigation. Indirect and edge effects will not be significant because the project site is already developed with a single-family home. Following mitigation, the impact to sensitive species and to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations is less than significant.

The cumulative impact to oak woodland from this project and TM 5008 would be 0.43 acre. The remaining projects in the cumulative impact area did not have identified impacts to oak woodland. While this would be considered a significant impact to oak woodland and the related sensitive species, both projects include mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant. TM 5008 would preserve 13.1 acres of oak woodland in open space, which far exceeds the 3:1 ratio established in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance as sufficient mitigation for impacts to oak woodland habitat and dependent species. Following mitigation, the cumulative impact is less than significant and the project's contribution is less than cumulatively considerable.

The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

The proposed project site has limited value as a wildlife movement corridor. The surrounding area is characterized by a mixture of disturbed habitat, fragmented oak woodlands, open space, and rural residences. The site is part of a residential property surrounded by a barbed-wire fence which inhibits access to the site. The local area does not contain topographic features or resources that would promote wildlife movement. In addition, the proposed disturbance area and operational requirements are minimal, and thus would not have a significant impact on wildlife movement.

The oak trees on site could potentially serve as nesting sites for raptors or migratory birds; therefore, the project will be conditioned to avoid clearing or grading within 500 feet of raptor habitat or within 300 feet of migratory bird habitat during the breeding season, except with the written concurrence of the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game, that no nesting migratory birds or raptors are present in the vicinity of the brushing, clearing or grading. Following mitigation, the impact to native wildlife nursery sites will be less than significant.

- b) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist, dated September 17, 2009, for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Diane Shalom, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical or archaeological resources.

- b) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains. In addition, the project would not impact any unique geologic feature that has been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan. Additionally, based on a site visit by Marcus Lubich on April 21, 2008, no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS –

Would the project

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; landslides; ?
 - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv. Landslides?
 - v. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
 - vi. Unstable geological conditions?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California and the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the California Building Code (CBC) classifies all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility area. Also, according to the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973, the soils on-site are identified as Cienega rocky coarse sandy loam, 9 to 30 percent slopes, eroded that have a soil erodibility rating of "severe" and is not considered expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994).

The project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death because the project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would not involve habitable structures or significant construction of property. Also, to ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from

strong seismic ground shaking as a result of this project. The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.

Based on the above, there will be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from rupture of a known earthquake fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or to substantial risks to life or property due to expansive soil. Also, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, nor will there be a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to unstable geologic conditions.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Also, all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve issuance of a building permit must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit.

b) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility and does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes; through

reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; through the emission or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or because the site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances; will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances; the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; nor is the project located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

- b) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), within a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface, or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is located outside a dam inundation zone.

- d) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project has demonstrated compliance with County Policy FP2, Fire Code Compliance for Cellular Facilities. The goal of the fire prevention standards in Policy FP2 are to make sure cellular sites are self protecting, with no fire agency emergency response anticipated, especially in major wildland incidents. This is accomplished primarily through construction with non-combustible exterior materials. Based on compliance with the County Policy FP2, Fire Code Compliance for Cellular Facilities, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

- e) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, the project is for an unmanned telecommunication facility that would not include any new residents or occupants that could be exposed to existing vector sources.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility which requires completion of a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) for Minor Projects which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the County of San Diego Watershed Protection Ordinance. The project proposes minor grading and trenching and construction of the telecommunication facility and will be required to implement site design measures and/or source control BMPs to protect pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff and receiving waters. Implementation of BMPs such as fiber rolls and sandbag barriers, as detailed in the SWMP for this project, will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

The proposed BMPs identified in the project's SWMP for minor projects are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do

to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes the installation of equipment cabinets and broadleaf monotree enclosed by a CMU wall. As outlined in the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) dated April 28, 2009, and prepared by Horizon Tower, the project will implement the following site design measures, source control,

and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: erosion control blankets, gravel bags, stabilized construction entrance, spill prevention/control, and concrete waste management. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMP's that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on-site or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons:

- a. Drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- b. The project will not increase water surface elevation in a watercourse with a watershed equal to or greater one square mile by 2/10 of the foot or more in height.
- c. The project will not increase surface runoff exiting the project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will not substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

- d) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: There are no existing or planned storm water drainage systems proposed by the project, nor does the project require such systems. Furthermore, the proposed project will not result in no a significant increase in pervious surfaces that could contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing storm water drainage systems. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

- e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any housing, therefore no impact from placing housing in a floodplain can occur.

- f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: 100-year flood hazard areas were not identified on the project site; therefore, no impact will occur.

- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam or from inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow because the project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would not involve people being located at the site and would not involve significant structures that would be considered a significant loss if flooding or other inundation events occurred. In addition, the San Diego County of Disaster Preparedness has an established emergency evacuation plan in the case of flooding or dam failure for the area and the project will not interfere with this plan.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility and does not propose the introduction of major roadways, water supply systems, or other major infrastructure that could significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the 1.6 Environmentally Constrained Area (ECA) Regional Land Use Element Policy and the (20) General Agriculture General Plan Land Use Designation.

The project is consistent with the General Plan because the wireless telecommunication facility would not change the planned residential character of the Land Use Designation due to masked design as a faux broadleaf tree, the existence of other vertical elements (existing natural vegetation), and the location of the proposed facility. The project also complies with the General Plan because civic uses are allowed if they support the local population. In addition, the project is consistent with Policy 4 of the Public Safety Element of the County General Plan that encourages the support, establishment, and continual improvement of Countywide telephone communications system, particularly with respect to enhancing emergency communications (refer to Section I. Aesthetics for additional information).

The project is subject to the policies of the Ramona Community Plan. The project, as proposed, is consistent with the Ramona Community Plan because it does not interfere either functionally or visually with adjacent land uses. The property is zoned A72, General Agricultural which permits wireless telecommunication facilities upon the issuance of a Major Use Permit, pursuant to The Zoning Ordinance Section 6980; therefore, the proposed project is consistent with plan and zone.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or to a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for a wireless telecommunication facility that would involve a limited area of construction. Due to the small size of the project, any future use or availability of mineral resources would not be lost as a result of the project.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project consists of the six Cingular equipment cabinets located within a 7-foot high CMU enclosure. Enclosing the proposed equipment cabinets will ensure the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours) and/or review by County Noise Specialist Emmet Aquino on July 24, 2009. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Ramona Community Plan

The County of San Diego General Plan, Ramona Community Plan, has a standard of CNEL 55 dB(A) for all projected noise contours near main circulation roadways, airports and other noise sources and requires mitigation if this level is exceeded. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 55 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 55 dB(A) contours) and review by County Noise Specialist Emmet Aquino on July 24, 2009. Additionally, the Major Use Permit application is to install a wireless facility. Noise associated with the facility will not exceed the 55 dBA CNEL required for noise sensitive areas pursuant to the Ramona Community Plan. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Ramona Community Plan.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A72 that has a one-hour average nighttime sound limit of 45 dBA. The adjacent properties are also zoned A72. Based on review by the County Noise Specialist Emmet Aquino on July 24, 2009, the project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards. Project consists of the six Cingular equipment cabinets located within a 7-foot high CMU enclosure. Typical equipment cabinet noise emissions produce an average of 65 dBA Leq at 5-feet. A total of six equipment cabinets have potential to generate 72.7 dBA Leq at 5-feet. Distance attenuation in relation to the nearest property line will reduce noise levels by -20 dB. The proposed 7-foot high CMU wall will provide a minimum of a -7 dB reduction. Incorporation of the 7-foot high CMU wall enclosure and attenuation by distance will result in noise levels to the nearest property line to comply with County Noise Standard of 45 dBA at the property line. Therefore, the proposed Cingular Facility will comply with County Noise Ordinance pursuant to Section 36.404.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

The project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404 and 36.409) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level. The proposed project is for a wireless telecommunication facility that would not result in an increase in noise levels by 10 decibels due to the limited noise producing equipment included as part of the project and based on the fact that the project will comply with noise limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable noise control regulations as detailed in Question XI. a). Also, the project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Vehicle traffic on nearby roadways and activities associated with cellular facilities. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of

the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly; displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or displace

substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would have no effect on the availability of housing. The project would not displace any housing or people and would not induce population growth. The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XIV. RECREATION – Would the project:

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobilehome park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in

either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will result in an additional 2 trips per month. The project was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The proposed project generates 2 additional trips. Given the County's traffic thresholds (Table 1) 100 ADT on a road operating at LOS F and 200 ADT on a road operating at LOS E there would be no direct impacts to a road segment. Using SANDAG's estimate for AM and PM peak hour trips, the project would generate less than five peak hour trips and will not exceed the five additional trips to a critical move threshold - especially when the trips are distributed on the road network. Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project impact on traffic volume, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Also refer to the answer for XV. b. below.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project will result in an additional 2 trips per month. The project was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to exceed a level of service (LOS) standard at the direct project level for the following reasons: The proposed project generates 2 additional trips. Given the County's traffic thresholds (Table 1) 100 ADT on a road operating at LOS F and 200 ADT on a road operating at LOS E there would be no direct impacts to a road segment. Using SANDAG's estimate for AM and PM peak hour trips, the project would generate less than five peak hour trips and will not exceed the five additional trips to a critical move threshold - especially when the trips are distributed on the road network. Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project-level impact on the LOS

standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program commits the County to construct additional capacity on identified Circulation Element roadways and includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. This program is based on a summary of projections method contained in the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report dated January 2005, and amended in February 2008. This document is considered an adopted planning document which meets the definition referenced in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(1)(B), which evaluates regional or area wide conditions contributing to cumulative transportation impacts. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, public and private funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

The proposed project generates 2 trips per month. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the unincorporated county that were analyzed by the TIF program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

In order to mitigate its incremental contribution to significant cumulative traffic impacts, the proposed project will pay the TIF prior to obtaining building permits.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter traffic safety on Little Page Lane. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County; therefore, the project has adequate emergency access.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: An area for one vehicle is available near the proposed telecommunication facility for the approximate monthly maintenance visits. Due to the limited frequency of vehicle trips to the site and the fact that only one car will visit the site per visit, parking capacity is not a significant issue. Nonetheless, there is ample space for one vehicle to park for the periodic maintenance visits. Thus, the project will not result in an insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is for an unmanned telecommunication facility. The implementation will not result in any construction or new road design features and does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, therefore the project will not conflict with policies regarding alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board or require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve any uses that will discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the project will not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements. Also, the project does not include new

or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities or require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities. As a result, significant environmental effects would not occur from the construction of new or expanded facilities.

- c) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve or require water services from a water district. The project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility that does rely on water service for any purpose.

- d) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project for an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility and will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers service capacity.

- e) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility and would not generate solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County. Therefore, compliance with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulation related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant that would be potentially impacted by the project, include

biological resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. Impacts to 0.07 acre of oak woodland and resident sensitive species will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through purchase of .21 acre of oak woodland in an approved mitigation bank in the central foothills or northern foothills ecoregion. Additionally, to avoid any direct or indirect impacts to nesting birds, the project shall restrict all brushing, clearing, and/or grading such that none will be allowed within 500 feet of nesting raptor habitat and/or 300 feet of migratory bird nesting habitat during the breeding season of raptors and migratory birds. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
#20085B LITTLE PAGE / AT&T WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY	P 03-123
#16 SWYCAFFER CORNER - AT&T WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY	ZAP 03-012
NEXTEL CA6403-B BALLENA VALLEY WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY	P 04-039
BALLENA WHALES VERIZON WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY	P 06-091
RAMONA RIDGE ESTATES TENTATIVE MAP	TM 5008
SPRINT NEXTEL CA8968D WITCH CREEK WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY	P07-002
COHN MINOR USE PERMIT MODIFICATION	ZAP87-034W1
INTERMOUNTAIN VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT MINOR USE PERMIT	ZAP 00-146/ZAP 00-146W1
AMERICAN TOWER MANAGEMENT MINOR USE PERMIT	ZAP 01-022

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to biological resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. Impacts to 0.07 acre of oak woodland and resident sensitive species will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio through purchase of .21 acre of oak woodland in an approved mitigation bank in the central foothills or northern foothills ecoregion. Additionally, to avoid any direct or indirect impacts to nesting birds, the project shall restrict all brushing, clearing, and/or grading such that none will be allowed within 500 feet of nesting raptor habitat and/or 300 feet of migratory bird nesting habitat during the breeding season of raptors and migratory birds. In order to mitigate its incremental contribution to cumulative traffic impacts, the proposed project will pay the Transportation Impact Fee prior to obtaining building permits. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to the following: Transportation and Traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes the payment of the Transportation Impact Fee prior to obtaining building permits. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

Biological Resources Letter Report, Little Page Lane Wireless Telecommunications Facility Major Use Permit; P08-013; Log No. 08-09-004. Michael Brandman Associates, July 6, 2009.

Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects; Little Page Lane Wireless Telecommunications Facility Major Use Permit; P08-013; Log No. 08-09-004. Horizon Tower, May 1, 2009.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances.
(www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000
(<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.
(www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLRPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.
(www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
(www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
(www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
(www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water,

Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental

Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov>), (www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 &13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attach.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.